United Nations A/C.5/57/SR.20

General Assembly
Fifty-seventh session

Official Records

Distr.: General
29 April 2003
English
Original: French

Fifth Committee

Summary record of the 20th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Monday, 4 November 2002, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Sharma ..... (Nepal)
Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions: Mr. Mselle

Contents

Agenda item 113: Programme planning

Agenda item 112: Programme budget for the biennium 2002-2003 (*continued*)

United Nations Fund for International Partnerships

Development Account

Revised estimates resulting from resolutions and decisions adopted by the Economic and Social Council at its substantive session of 2002

Revised administrative arrangements for the International Trade Centre

Strengthening the Terrorism Prevention Branch of the Secretariat

Inter-organizational security measures: framework for accountability for the United Nations field security management system

Agenda item 147: Financing of the United Nations Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

02-67455 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10 a.m.

Agenda item 113: Programme planning (A/57/6, Programmes 1 (and Corr.1), 2, 3, 5, 7 to 19 and 24 to 26, A/57/16, A/C.5/57/12, A/C.5/57/17, A/57/62, A/57/68, A/C.5/57/19 and A/C.5/57/20)

1. **Mr. Mazet** (Chairman of the Committee for Programme and Coordination), introducing the report of the Committee for Programme and Coordination on the work of its forty-second session (A/57/16), said that the Committee had been able to consider the entire report of the Secretary-General on the proposed programme budget outline for the biennium 2004-2005 (A/57/85) during the first part of its session. The Committee had considered the outline using as a framework the four elements listed in paragraph 1 of the report of the Secretary-General: the preliminary estimate of resources to accommodate the proposed programme of activities during the biennium; priorities, reflecting general trends of a broad sectoral nature; real growth, positive or negative, compared with the previous budget; and size of the contingency fund expressed as a percentage of the overall level of resources. The Committee's conclusions and recommendations were contained in paragraphs 25 and 26 of the report.

2. The Committee had reviewed the proposed revisions to the medium-term plan for the period 2002-2005 and had recommended that all the proposed provisions should be adopted, subject to the modifications contained in chapter II, section B, of its report. In connection with programme 7, Economic and social affairs, the Committee had recommended that, following the endorsement of the Monterrey Consensus by the General Assembly, the Secretary-General should prepare a proposal for a new subprogramme on financing for development for consideration by the General Assembly at its fifty-seventh session. It had also recommended that, in accordance with the outcome of the World Summit on Sustainable Development, the Secretary-General should submit revisions to relevant subprogrammes for the consideration of and action by the General Assembly at its fifty-seventh session.

3. In connection with programme 8, entitled "Africa: New Agenda for Development", the Committee had recommended that, after the final review and appraisal of the United Nations New Agenda for the Development of Africa in the 1990s that were expected to be carried out during the fifty-seventh session of the General Assembly, the Secretary-General should submit a revised programme to reflect the outcomes of the review. In that regard, and in connection with programme 14, Economic and social development in Africa, the Committee had recommended to the General Assembly that it should examine that programme in the light of the aforementioned review and of any decisions which might be taken on the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD). In connection with programmes 9 to 13 and 15 to 19, the Committee had recommended to the General Assembly that it should approve the proposed revisions, subject to certain modifications.

4. He pointed out that the Committee had been able to reach consensus on the recommendations relating to programme 19, Human rights. In addition, it had also recommended that the General Assembly should approve the text of the new programme 26, Least developed countries, landlocked developing countries and small island developing States, for inclusion in the medium-term plan for the period 2002-2005, subject to certain modifications.

5. Mr. Halbwachs (Assistant Secretary-General for Programme Planning, Budget and Accounts, Controller) presented the proposed revisions to 20 programmes in the medium-term plan for the period 2002-2005, including the new programme 26. In its consideration of programme 1, Political affairs, the Committee for Programme and Coordination had recommended that the Secretary-General should provide further information to the General Assembly on the applicability of regulation 4.13 and rule 104.8 of the Regulations and Rules Governing Programme Planning, with regard to the revisions to the list of mandates relating to subprogramme 4, Decolonization. The basis for the addition to that list of General Assembly decision 56/410 was explained in document A/C.5/57/12.

6. Turning to the recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Coordination on programme 7, Economic and social affairs, in paragraphs 107 and 108 of its report, he drew attention to document A/C.5/57/19, which stated that the Second Committee was considering the report of the Secretary-General on the outcome of the International Conference on Financing for Development (A/57/344);

the outcome of that review would guide the organizational and programmatic arrangements for follow-up to and implementation of the Monterrey Consensus. Revisions to the medium-term plan would be submitted after the Second Committee had taken action on the proposals contained in the report of the Secretary-General.

7. With regard to the revisions reflecting the outcome of the World Summit on Sustainable Development, the Assembly was currently considering various options and modalities for the intergovernmental review of follow-up to conferences with a view to achieving better integration of those processes, in particular as they related to the millennium development goals. Proposed revisions to the medium-term plan would be submitted at a subsequent stage so as to take into account the outcome of those reviews. Should the Assembly finalize the two reviews when it was too late for it to consider the proposed revisions, proposals would be made in conjunction with the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2004-2005; such a procedure would be in accordance with Regulation 5.2 of the Regulations and Rules Governing Programme Planning.

8. With respect to programme 8, Africa: New Agenda for Development, the Ad Hoc Committee of the Whole of the General Assembly for the Final Review and Appraisal of the Implementation of the United Nations New Agenda for the Development of Africa in the 1990s had recently completed its work. Depending on the timing of the General Assembly's decision on that issue, additional revisions to programme 8 might be proposed either at the current session or in connection with the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2004-2005 in accordance with Regulation 5.2.

9. Once the General Assembly had approved all the revisions, the revised plan would serve as a framework for preparation of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2004-2005.

Agenda item 112: Programme budget for the biennium 2002-2003 (*continued*)

United Nations Fund for International Partnerships (A/57/133 and A/57/7/Add.6)

10. **Mr. Dossal** (Executive Director of the United Nations Fund for International Partnerships (UNFIP)) introduced the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Fund for International Partnerships (A/57/133) and said that, at the end of 2001, the Fund's programme portfolio had stood at 222 projects totalling $423 million, involving project activities in 120 countries by 33 United Nations implementing partners, with a focus on the most targeted and strategic proposals. In addition, the United Nations Foundation (UNF) planned to promote new fund-raising options for project financing.

11. In response to the comment made by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions concerning the onerous nature and high cost of its procedures, the Fund had undertaken to take steps designed, inter alia, to minimize the bureaucratic procedures for project approval and follow-up.

12. **Mr. Mselle** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the report of ACABQ on the United Nations Fund for International Partnerships, said that it contained the Advisory Committee's comments on the latest report of the Secretary-General on that subject (A/57/133). The total amount programmed from the date of the Fund's creation to 31 August 2002 amounted to $486.6 million, including $20.5 million for administrative support costs. In paragraphs 6 and 7 of its report, the Advisory Committee recommended that the procedures followed over the past five years for formulating projects and reporting on the results obtained therefrom should be subjected to a comprehensive systematic analysis in order to further streamline them and to determine whether the Fund's activities could have been more focused and, thus, more effective. As stated in the report of the Secretary-General, compelling evidence of the impact of projects supported by the Fund and the United Nations Foundation would be critical to generating additional resources and creating public-private partnerships in support of United Nations causes. In that connection, the Advisory Committee noted with satisfaction the focus in 2002 on evaluating clusters of projects and the utilization of a systems application in order to enhance the capacity of the Fund to track project implementation and fund flows, thus streamlining the financial reporting modalities of its implementing partners.

13. **Mr. Repasch** (United States of America) said that his delegation had studied with interest the report on the United Nations Fund for International Partnerships

and the report on implementation of projects financed from the Development Account. Those two initiatives were a new way of approaching development on the basis of clearly defined objectives and a strong evaluation component. He therefore wondered how the Secretariat planned to follow up the Advisory Committee's comments in its report on the United Nations Fund for International Partnerships (A/57/7/Add.6) to the effect that the current monitoring and evaluation process appeared to be onerous and bureaucratic and that the time had come to assess and streamline it (para. 6). It would also be interesting to know how the activities financed by the Fund were coordinated with those of the regular programme of technical cooperation. Those three areas were closely connected and were a major source of development funding; it would therefore be desirable to view them as a whole in order to improve management, evaluation and follow-up and to facilitate decision-making on resource allocation.

14. **Mr. Dossal** (Executive Director of the United Nations Fund for International Partnerships) said that the Fund dealt with project monitoring and evaluation by asking the project's implementing agency to evaluate it. The information obtained was then analysed in order to determine what lessons could be learned for future programmes. ACABQ had rightly noted that, in view of the large number of projects, it was important to establish common areas and themes in an effort to simplify the reporting and follow-up processes and thus to streamline activities. The areas covered by the Fund, the Development Account and the regular technical cooperation programme were indeed connected and, as the end of the first five-year period approached, the stakeholders were seeking to determine the extent to which those projects could be refocused on common objectives in the interests of increased efficiency. A report on that issue would be submitted to the Committee in 2003.

15. **Mr. Repasch** (United States of America) said that his comment had referred more generally to potential synergies between the three elements; it was most important to ensure that all spending, whatever its source, helped achieve the established objectives. His delegation would pursue discussion of that issue in the informal consultations.

16. **Mr. Dossal** (Executive Director of the United Nations Fund for International Partnerships) said that the Development Account did provide a point of reference for the Fund and that the Fund's activities were consistent with the programmes on, inter alia, the environment and population which the General Assembly had approved. The Fund did not implement projects as such; rather, it functioned as a facilitator. Projects financed from the Development Account accounted for about one-twentieth of all development projects implemented by the United Nations system. Nevertheless, as the representative of the United States of America had stressed, common areas must be taken into account in order to guarantee the synergy and efficiency of programmes.

17. The Chairman suggested that the Secretariat should prepare for the Committee's consideration a draft decision stating that the Committee recommended that the General Assembly should take note of the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Fund for International Partnerships (A/57/133) and that it endorsed the comments made by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/57/7/Add.6).

Development Account (A/57/360 and A/57/7/Add.5)

18. **Mr. Sach** (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division) introduced the report of the Secretary-General on implementation of projects financed from the Development Account (A/57/360). That report, the second on the Fund's operation, showed major progress in its activities; 43 projects had been approved under the Account's three tranches (1998-1999, 2000-2001 and 2002-2003). To date, 69.6 per cent of planned expenses under the first tranche, 55.9 per cent of those approved under the second tranche and 4.9 per cent of those approved under the third tranche had been made. Tables I, II and III showed the status and level of implementation rate of the various projects under each tranche. Most of the current biennium, for which the implementation rate was only 4.9 per cent, had been devoted to the conclusion of agreements with the implementing agencies concerned.

19. With respect to the relationship between the Development Account and the United Nations Fund for International Partnerships and other development activities, he pointed out that the Fund's activities involved the entire United Nations system, including the specialized agencies, whereas those of the Development Account were limited to United Nations

departments such as those mentioned in tables I, II and III of the report. The Development Account was not used to fund posts.

20. With respect to the viability of activities funded under the Account, the original idea had been that the Account would be used to launch projects, which would then be implemented from other resources. In other words, activities funded under the Development Account should not place a continuing burden on the regular budget. Since that transition had not yet taken place, the continued implementation of those activities was not guaranteed over the long term; that was a problem which deserved careful consideration and should be taken into account in adding new tranches to the Development Account, including a fourth tranche for the biennium 2004-2005.

21. **Mr. Mselle** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the report of ACABQ (A/57/7/Add.5), said that the Advisory Committee welcomed the streamlining of the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of projects financed from the Development Account (A/57/360) but was expecting further improvements, notably a clearer explanation of the objectives achieved and the results obtained, including those relating to capacity-building in recipient countries, as set out in resolution 53/220 B.

22. The Advisory Committee recommended that the report should be submitted in future in the context of the proposed programme budget. That would facilitate a clear understanding of the relationship between the activities carried out under the support account and those carried out under section 21 regular programme of technical cooperation and would go some way towards clarifying the points raised by the representative of the United States of America. The Advisory Committee therefore expected that the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2004-2005 would contain more up-to-date information and that that information would be submitted in section 33 development account. The Advisory Committee would use the information contained in document A/57/360 to evaluate the Secretary-General's proposals when they were submitted in the context of the preparation of the budget for 2004-2005. Since the budget fascicles would be considered by the Advisory Committee and CPC at their spring and summer sessions, the information to be included in section 33 should be submitted during that period, rather than in the autumn.

23. **Mr. Repasch** (United States of America) requested further information on the last column of tables I, II and III in the report of the Secretary-General, which gave the percentage of implementation by project. He wondered whether that rate reflected the percentage of objectives achieved or the percentage of planned expenditures made. Reports A/57/360 and A/57/7/Add.5 provided little information on the results achieved. Several years previously, when the Development Account had been created, the projects implemented under it had been supposed to have very specific objectives and to be implemented rapidly. It was therefore disappointing to learn from the tables contained in the report of ACABQ that most of the projects were behind schedule.

24. **Ms. Udo** (Nigeria) said it was unfortunate that the ACABQ report provided very little information on what had been achieved. In particular, she wondered about the status of the project entitled "Urban pollution of superficial and groundwater aquifers in Africa", mentioned in annex II of the report; it was to have been completed in September 2002, but no further information was provided.

25. **Mr. Sach** (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division) explained that the reference to 69.6 per cent of implementation by project in the last column of table I represented the percentage of planned expenditures under the first tranche that had been made (biennium 1998-1999).

26. Follow-up on project results was, in fact, provided. Detailed information could be found on the Development Account web site, the address of which was given in paragraph 12 of the report. The entry for each project mentioned on that site included a summary of its objectives, impact and rate of implementation. In the interests of brevity, the report of the Secretary-General focused on strategic management elements of the Development Account. In the case of the project mentioned by the representative of Nigeria, there had been problems at the launching stage but activities appeared to be progressing and by the end of the project the five teams should be in a position to produce vulnerability charts that could be used to issue early warnings on pollution. Additional proposals would be made on the basis of lessons learned with a view to the development of an expanded strategy

applicable to other regions of Africa. Contrary to what was stated in the report, the project's scheduled completion date was September 2003.

27. **Mr. Mselle** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) drew attention to the comments made by the Advisory Committee on that issue in its report (A/57/7/Add.5). In paragraph 4, the Advisory Committee stated that 43 projects had been approved thus far at a total cost of $39.2 million and that, as of 30 June 2002, $17 million of that $39.2 million had been spent.

28. In paragraph 5 of the report, it was stated that a majority of the projects had only become operational in 2000, that none of the projects had been completed by the end of 2001 and that their completion dates were now foreseen as much as one or two years later than originally indicated, complicating, for the time being, the issue of proper assessment of impact and accomplishments. Those projects had started later than anticipated because the General Assembly had to approve the governance system for the support account, a process which had taken quite some time. It was thus too early to be able to judge the impact of many of the projects that had been approved. An assessment should be possible in two years' time, when the majority of the projects currently under implementation would have been completed.

29. **Mr. Repasch** (United States of America) welcomed the Secretariat's use of other means of disseminating information and its efforts to keep the Committee's documentation to the necessary minimum. However, he thought that it was problematic for the percentage of planned expenditures made to be the only indicator for project implementation and wondered whether there were plans to include in the report another type of indicator, such as the percentage of objectives achieved to date. He fully agreed with the ACABQ Chairman's statement that it was too soon to evaluate impact; however, in light of the problems associated, inter alia, with the sustainability of achievements, mentioned in paragraph 22 of the report of the Secretary-General, he did not think it appropriate to wait two or three years before judging the relevance of projects.

30. **Mr. Sach** (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that one way of giving Member States enough information to evaluate the projects would be to report on each project as it was concluded rather than on all ongoing projects, of which there would be nearly 60 for the biennium 2004-2005. A summary of completed projects could also be included in the report on programme implementation prepared at the end of the biennium. Another solution would be to distribute at the informal consultations one-page summaries for each project mentioned on the web site in order to determine how much of that information should be included in the report submitted to the Committee.

31. **The Chairman** suggested that the Secretariat should prepare for the Committee's consideration a draft decision stating that the Committee recommended that the General Assembly should take note of the report of the Secretary-General on implementation of projects financed from the Development Account (A/57/360) and that it endorsed the recommendations made by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/57/Add.5).

32. **Mr. Repasch** (United States of America) said that he would prefer to continue discussion of those matters in informal consultations.

33. **The Chairman** suggested that the discussion should continue on that basis.

34. *It was so decided.*

Revised estimates resulting from resolutions and decisions adopted by the Economic and Social Council at its substantive session of 2002 (A/C.5/57/13 and A/57/7/Add.12)

35. **Mr. Sach** (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division), introducing the report of the Secretary-General on the subject, said that the estimated additional requirements that could be absorbed from appropriations were $1,200,000, and not $800,000, as indicated in the summary. The correct figure was in the body of the report.

36. At its substantive session of 2002, the Economic and Social Council had adopted some resolutions and decisions that entailed additional expenditures. The relevant information was contained in section II of the report. As indicated in annex I, a substantial portion of such expenditures could be financed from within the existing provisions of the programme budget for the biennium 2002-2003. However, the expenditures summarized in annex II — appropriations relating to

the working group on structural adjustment programmes, possible additional meetings of the Commission on Human Rights and the second session of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues — would require additional appropriations in a total amount of $600,000. In accordance with the established procedure, that amount should be included in the summary of requirements chargeable to the contingency fund. But, since the bulk of such requirements related to meeting services and the precise requirements in that regard could not be determined before 2003, there was still a degree of uncertainty.

37. Consequently, as indicated in section V of the report, it was recommended at the current stage that the General Assembly should approve the provision of $44,700 in additional appropriations under section 22 as a charge against the contingency fund, invite the Economic and Social Council to review its decision concerning the holding of additional meetings of the Commission on Human Rights and request the Secretary-General to provide in any event such conference services as might be required consequent to the application of the decisions of the Council. On the whole, it was possible that the amount of $600,000 could be revised further downward should all the scheduled conference services not be utilized.

38. **Mr. Mselle** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the related report of ACABQ, said that, taking into account the possibility for absorption of some of the expenditure arising from the resolutions and decisions of the Economic and Social Council, an additional appropriation in a total amount not exceeding approximately $600,000 would be required under sections 2, 22 and 27E of the budget. That additional expenditure would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement of programme budget implications and revised estimates, in accordance with the procedures governing the use of contingency fund. The Advisory Committee would revert to the matter when it considered the consolidated statement, which would be submitted by the Secretary-General to the General Assembly.

39. **Mr. Christensen** (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the European Union, and the associated countries Bulgaria, Cyprus, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia, commended the Secretariat for the exceptional efforts it had made to accommodate within existing resources the extra expenditure resulting from resolutions and decisions of the Economic and Social Council. The European Union was of the view that the comments concerning the contingency fund made in section IV of the report of the Secretary-General (A/C.5/57/13) would make the Committee's discussion more productive, once the Committee had a clearer picture of the total amount of expenditure to be charged against the fund. He commended the Department of General Assembly Affairs and Conference Services for its flexibility in accommodating a number of unforeseen meetings, no doubt the result of a more disciplined management of conference services. The European Union looked forward to further progress in that regard in 2003 and, in that connection, supported the Secretariat's recommendation in paragraph 25 (b) of the report inviting the Economic and Social Council to ensure that the Commission on Human Rights did not hold additional meetings at its fifty-ninth session.

40. **Ms. Buergo** (Cuba) said that her delegation, like the Danish delegation, welcomed the laudable efforts of the Department of General Assembly Affairs to accommodate the many requests addressed to it for additional meetings services within existing resources. She took note of paragraph 20 of the Secretary-General's report with respect to the procedures to be followed if additional expenditures proposed exceeded the resources available from the contingency fund. Referring to paragraph 21, she sought clarifications on the procedures that would give the General Assembly a clearer idea of the levels of priority to be assigned to different activities to be charged to the contingency fund; that would make it easier to take decisions on activities to be deferred or terminated. Referring to the recommendation in paragraph 25 (b) inviting the Economic and Social Council to review its decision concerning possible additional meetings of the Commission on Human Rights, she noted that, while her delegation fully endorsed the comments concerning the Council's prerogatives, it was of the view that no organ should be given preferential treatment.

41. **Mr. Yamanaka** (Japan) wanted to know what impact the Council's resolutions and decisions would have on programmes, since the report of the Secretary-General had failed to spell it out. It would also be helpful to know the criteria used by the Secretariat to determine what additional expenditure could be financed from within the existing provisions. It was

noted in paragraph 14 of the Secretary-General's report that additional meetings of the Commission on Human Rights authorized by the Council should be utilized only if they proved necessary. That condition should be strictly adhered to. Lastly, given what was stated in paragraph 3 of the Advisory Committee's report, his delegation believed that the Committee should revert to the matter in the context of its consideration of the statement of programme budget implications and revised estimates.

42. **Ms. Atwooll** (United States of America) said that her delegation too welcomed the efforts made to redefine an order of priorities in the new activities proposed and to finance them to the extent possible from within existing provisions. She wondered whether the Economic and Social Council had already considered the recommendation in paragraph 25 (b) of the Secretary-General's report inviting it to review the need for additional meetings of the Commission on Human Rights. In her delegation's view, the Fifth Committee was not in a position at the current juncture to take a decision on the revised estimates in the report and should wait for the statement of programme budget implications before doing so.

43. **Mr. Dutton** (Australia) said that he shared the concerns expressed by the representatives of Cuba and Japan; he too wondered what criteria the Secretariat used in deciding which expenditures would be absorbed and in establishing priorities among the various activities to be funded from the contingency fund.

44. **Mr. Sach** (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division), responding to questions and comments from delegations, provided information on the programme budget implications of Economic and Social Council decisions. Decision 2002/224 would involve only a change in the number of meetings of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, which would result in a greater number of outputs in the programme budget performance report. A detailed statement of the programme budget implications of decision 2002/270 on racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance had been submitted to the Commission on Human Rights and the Council. Decision 2002/281 would affect only the number of meetings of the Commission on Human Rights, which would be reflected, as necessary, in the final programme budget performance report for the biennium. Decision 2002/285 would involve only changing the venue for the annual session of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues from Geneva to New York.

45. The decision to absorb the costs of funding a given activity was based primarily on the calendar of meetings since the additional costs generally involved conference services. When scheduling or other considerations made it impossible for the conference services required for planned additional meetings to be funded from existing resources, the costs of those meetings must be covered from the contingency fund.

46. Lastly, the procedure for considering the consolidated statement of programme budget implications was dependent on all the Main Committees having completed their work on questions with such implications by 22 November so that the Secretariat could receive all the statements of implications by the end of November. It would then be in a position to determine the total amount of expenditure to be covered from the contingency fund. If that amount exceeded the fund's available resources, as was likely, it would be necessary to establish priorities under General Assembly resolution 42/211 so that, if necessary, activities could be changed or postponed, which would require close consultation with the other Main Committees.

Revised administrative arrangements for the International Trade Centre (A/57/7/Add.10 and A/C.5/57/14)

47. **Mr. Sach** (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division) introduced the report of the Secretary-General on experience in applying the revised administrative arrangements approved by the General Assembly for the International Trade Centre (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development/World Trade Organization) in its decision 53/411 (b) (A/C.5/57/14). The United Nations and the World Trade Organization (WTO) contributed jointly and equally to the financing of the regular budget of the International Trade Centre (ITC); the different budgetary cycles and review processes of the two organizations posed an administrative problem. The United Nations budget cycle was biennial whereas that of WTO was annual; the financial operations of the United Nations were presented in United States dollars whereas those of WTO were presented in Swiss francs; and the two bodies had different budget consideration and approval mechanisms. The ITC budget preparation

process was therefore quite complicated, since it had to ensure that the same sums of money were allocated to the same purposes by the two bodies and that ITC had a coherent budget and could function smoothly.

48. In order to reflect the complexity of that process, the report described the different stages of preparation of the programme budget for the biennium 2002-2003. The Secretariat proposed to review the entire process with the ITC secretariat in order to make joint proposals that would be submitted to the United Nations General Assembly and the General Council of WTO with a view to a reduction in the number of budgetary documents and simplification of the current budgetary approval process for the ITC programme budget. However, those proposals would affect only bienniums following that of 2004-2005.

49. **Mr. Mselle** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) introduced the report of ACABQ (A/57/7/Add.10) and said that, in paragraph 6 of its report, the Committee recommended approval of the Secretary-General's proposal.

Strengthening the Terrorism Prevention Branch of the Secretariat (A/57/7/Add.13, A/57/152 and Corr.1, A/57/152/Add.1 and Corr.1 and A/57/152/Add.2)

50. **Mr. Sach** (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division) introduced the report of the Secretary-General on strengthening the Terrorism Prevention Branch of the Secretariat (A/57/152 and Corr.1, A/57/152/Add.1 and Corr.1 and A/57/152/Add.2). The report was a response to General Assembly resolution 56/253, in which the Secretary-General was requested to make proposals to strengthen the Terrorism Prevention Branch at the United Nations Office at Vienna, and had originally been submitted to the Third Committee under agenda item 102.

51. Section V of the main report described the resources available under the programme budget for the biennium 2002-2003 which could be used to implement the strengthened programme of work and the additional resources that would be required. The programme budget provided for two Professional posts (1 P-4 and 1 P-5); however, implementation of the proposed expanded programme of work would require the creation of three new Professional posts (1 D-1, 1 P-4 and 1 P-3) and 2 General Service (Other level) posts. Details on the cost requirements for those posts and related expenses, a total of $563,800, were provided in the annex to document A/57/152/Add.2.

52. He drew attention to paragraph 2 of that document, which stated that, if the posts created in 2003 were not occupied until late 2003 or early 2004, the related appropriation required for the biennium 2002-2003 would be substantially reduced or eliminated. Given the limited resources available in the contingency fund, to which the posts in question were chargeable, one option would be to establish the posts in 2003 on the understanding that they would not be occupied until late 2003 or early 2004.

53. The document contained revised estimates; it was not a statement of the programme budget implications of resolution A/C.3/57/L.10, adopted by the Third Committee on 10 October 2002, in which the General Assembly took note with appreciation of the report of the Secretary-General on strengthening the Terrorism Prevention Branch of the Secretariat.

54. **Mr. Mselle** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the report of ACABQ on the strengthening of the Terrorism Prevention Branch of the Secretariat (A/57/7/Add.13), said that the Advisory Committee's recommendations were contained in paragraphs 7 and 8 of the report. The Secretary-General had proposed several options for the financing of the additional posts and the Advisory Committee had decided to retain the option it deemed to be the most appropriate; it recommended to the Fifth Committee that proposals for additional resources, including posts, should be considered in the context of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2004-2005.

55. The Advisory Committee also suggested that the Secretary-General could be authorized to initiate the recruitment process during 2003, on the understanding that he would inform the candidates that the availability of the posts in question would be subject to approval by the General Assembly. In addition, the Secretary-General could, subject to the availability of funds for the biennium 2002-2003, recruit staff on a temporary basis for 2003, on the understanding that the continuation of their functions beyond 31 December 2003 would be subject to the approval by the Assembly of the related resources for the biennium 2004-2005.

56. He considered that proceeding in that manner would greatly facilitate the consideration of the issue.

57. **Mr. Yamanaka** (Japan) welcomed the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ). He wondered whether the Fifth Committee was competent to consider a proposal relating to the Secretariat's programme of work which was neither a statement of programme budget implications nor a revised draft estimate. However, his delegation agreed with the Advisory Committee's idea that the proposals for necessary additional resources, including posts, should be considered in the context of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2004-2005.

58. **Mr. Bouheddou** (Algeria) welcomed the fact that the Secretariat had been able to draft the report requested by the General Assembly in resolution 56/253. His delegation was particularly interested in the issue of strengthening the Terrorism Prevention Branch of the Secretariat. The Secretary-General's report responded to the desire to see the Centre efficiently implementing its programme of work and fulfilling the mandates approved by the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council in the area of preventing and fighting against terrorism. His delegation was also satisfied with the recommendations made by ACABQ in paragraphs 7 and 8 of its report, and would pay close attention to the issue during the informal consultations.

59. **Ms. Buergo** (Cuba) said that her delegation had some questions about the procedure to be followed by the Committee. She noted with satisfaction that the representative of the Secretary-General had referred, in paragraph 2 of document A/57/152/Add.2, to General Assembly resolution 42/211 concerning the contingency fund, and hoped that the Secretary-General would not only strive to apply it but would succeed in doing so. With reference to paragraph 2 of that document, she noted that, to date, it had not been possible to identify activities under section 14 of the programme budget which might be cancelled, postponed or modified in favour of the strengthening of the Terrorism Prevention Branch. She recalled the provisions of paragraph 6 of the annex to resolution 42/211, according to which the respective legislative bodies should take action on the indications of alternatives included in each statement of programme budget implications and in each proposal for revised estimates at the time they adopted their decisions or resolutions. In her opinion, the Fifth Committee needed to have a clearer idea of which activities had lower priority and could be postponed or modified.

60. In addition, while taking note of the fact that the proposal made by ACABQ in paragraph 7 of its report would facilitate the Committee's consideration of the issue, she failed to understand why the procedure had to be changed and wondered whether the solution suggested by the Advisory Committee would increase the Committee's workload. She would like the Chairman of the Advisory Committee to clarify the issue.

61. **Mr. Chaudhry** (Pakistan) pointed out that, to fully understand the issue, it was necessary to read a whole series of documents: the Secretary-General's report, its addenda and corrigenda, General Assembly resolutions 56/253, 56/123 and 56/261, the relevant Economic and Social Council resolution adopted in July, Security Council resolution 1373 (2001) and the report of ACABQ. He also recalled that resolution A/C.3/57/L.10, adopted by the Third Committee, did not refer expressly to strengthening the mandate of the Terrorism Prevention Branch but suggested a number of options relating to the financing of counter-terrorism activities. He would like to know which measures had been taken in that area.

62. He also wished to know whether the Committee had already considered the increased allocation of resources mentioned in document A/57/152 and when it would be presented with a statement of programme budget implications. In addition to the two Professional posts which had already been included in the programme budget for the biennium 2002-2003, it would have been easy to include the proposed new posts in the proposed budget for the biennium 2004-2005, as had been suggested by ACABQ, rather then charging them to the contingency fund, which was already being heavily drawn upon.

63. He welcomed the recommendation made by ACABQ in paragraph 7 of its report and took note of that made in paragraph 8. However, he was afraid that the proposed procedure would set a precedent and that it was in breach of standard procedures in the area of human resources management. He would like to hear the opinion of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on that issue. In that connection, he agreed with the views expressed by the representative of Japan and considered that the Committee should endorse the

recommendation contained in paragraph 7 of the report of ACABQ.

64. **Mr. Kelapile** (Botswana) said that, as the representative of Algeria had indicated, the Group of African States had taken note with appreciation of the report of the Secretary-General on strengthening the Terrorism Prevention Branch. In that connection, he noted that, within the context of the review of General Assembly resolution 56/253, the African Group had expressed a special interest in strengthening that Branch, stressing that developing countries, particularly those in Africa, would need considerable assistance in order to be able to contribute effectively to anti-terrorism efforts.

65. He noted the remarks by the representative of the Secretary-General on the problems with regard to the contingency fund and, in that connection, welcomed the Advisory Committee's recommendation on financing the additional posts proposed.

66. **Mr. Repasch** (United States of America) said that the issue was a very important one. His delegation had repeatedly stated that priority should be given to terrorism prevention activities.

67. Like the representative of Japan, however, he questioned the nature of the proposal and wondered whether the Committee was in a position to consider the substantive questions relating to the programme. He, too, agreed with the remarks made by other delegations concerning the situation of the contingency fund and the need to set priorities. Those proposals had an impact not only on the current programme budget but also on future budgets.

68. He therefore hoped that the proposals on strengthening the Terrorism Prevention Branch of the Secretariat were included in the list of proposed expenditures and appropriations for which the Committee must determine an order of priority. The Secretary-General should consider the question of the proposed budget for the biennium 2004-2005 in the context of the overall review of priority activities he had undertaken to carry out in his most recent reform proposal.

69. **Mr. Mazumdar** (India) said that, while the question was very complex, it was important not to lose sight of the main objective of combating terrorism.

70. He concurred with the statements made by the representatives of the United States, Botswana and Algeria, who had strongly supported the proposals and endorsed the recommendations of the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee. He noted that the Third Committee had adopted a resolution on the question and believed that the Fifth Committee should not reopen substantive consideration of resolutions adopted by other Committees.

71. **Mr. Kramer** (Canada), noting the concerns expressed with regard to the review of such documents in the Fifth Committee rather than in the functional commissions, expressed his strong support for the proposal to strengthen the Terrorism Prevention Branch of the Secretariat. He welcomed the Advisory Committee's proposal, which should enable the Secretariat to launch certain activities during the current biennium and defer consideration of all financing questions to the next biennium without having to draw on the contingency fund or limit the Secretary-General's freedom of action.

72. **Mr. Sach** (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division), responding to delegations' comments, said that the Secretariat would not issue a statement of programme budget implications for the proposed measures, as the report of the Secretary-General, which was the equivalent of revised estimates, fulfilled the mandate set out by the General Assembly in its resolution 56/253. Paragraphs 13 to 22 of the main report (A/57/152) and its second addendum (A/57/152/Add.2) contained all the necessary elements for a revised estimate of expenditures.

73. As for substantive consideration by the technical bodies, the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice had considered the question in July 2002, as indicated in document A/57/152/Add.1, and submitted its report on the question to the Economic and Social Council. Moreover, the Third Committee had considered proposals for the facilitation and/or provision of legislative and capacity-building assistance, identification and dissemination of best practices and identification and promotion of awareness of links between terrorism and related crimes.

74. **Mr. Mselle** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), responding to the comments made by delegations concerning the recommendation contained in paragraph 8 of the report of ACABQ (A/57/7/Add.13), said that it was not the first time that

the Advisory Committee had made a recommendation of that kind. The Advisory Committee had already recommended to the Fifth Committee in the past that new expenditure should be financed through absorption or deferred to the next biennium, rather than being charged to the contingency fund.

75. There was no risk that such a recommendation might set a precedent, as the representative of Pakistan feared, since it was subject to the approval by the General Assembly of the number and grades of the posts proposed for the biennium 2004-2005.

76. Moreover, the procedure advocated would not create any additional work for the Committee, as the representative of Cuba feared; on the contrary, it would be far less onerous than if the Fifth Committee had to consider the various options proposed by the Secretary-General and rank them in order of priority.

77. **Mr. Yamanaka** (Japan) stressed that the procedure of issuing corrigenda with regard to the agenda item on a document created ambiguity. Moreover, it was not clear from the response of the representative of the Secretariat that the Third Committee had engaged in a substantive consideration of the proposed measures as, in paragraph 2 of resolution A/C.3/57/L.10, it merely took note with appreciation of the report of the Secretary-General.

Inter-organizational security measures: framework for accountability for the United Nations field security management system
(A/57/365 and A/57/7/Add.11)

78. **Mr. Myat** (United Nations Security Coordinator), introducing the report of the Secretary-General on the framework for accountability for the United Nations field security management system, pointed out that the report was the result of several rounds of inter-agency meetings which had begun in January 2002 in the context of the Inter-Agency Security Management Network. It had been approved by the High-Level Committee on Management on behalf of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination and took full account of the report of the Secretary-General on accountability and responsibility (A/55/270).

79. The report identified all the actors at all levels within the United Nations system who had security responsibilities and specified the nature of the responsibilities. It also outlined the mechanisms used to implement accountability, including: criteria governing the selection of individuals who would be given security responsibilities, training of and self-learning by those individuals, performance management and inspection and review. Lastly, it discussed the establishment of a system of incentives. The annex contained a generic security policy statement which had been adopted by all United Nations organizations.

80. Training was an essential element of the accountability mechanism. In January, a CD-ROM on personal security awareness would be made available to all personnel assigned to field missions, and they would be required to familiarize themselves with it before taking up their posts. Training of designated officials and security management teams was continuing and new projects intended to enhance that training were under discussion. As soon as his Office was fully staffed, it would commence inspection and compliance missions to verify that trained personnel were carrying out their functions. All major security incidents would be investigated and his Office would establish the lessons learned from such investigations.

81. With regard to the staffing of the external offices, 98 of the 100 approved Professional posts had been filled by June 2002. Each duty station had been provided with a standardized budget to cover the running costs of the security unit. At Headquarters, the Office would have to wait until it moved to less cramped quarters before it could proceed with the recruitment of the necessary additional personnel. That move should take place shortly.

82. The framework described in the report should go hand in hand with the implementation of similar systems of accountability in areas other than security. Furthermore, given the diversity of personnel rules and procedures in the various United Nations organizations, it was impossible to devise one system of sanctions which would apply across the board. Lastly, it was vital that Member States made a concerted effort to ensure that attacks on United Nations staff did not go unpunished, as had happened too frequently.

83. **Mr. Mselle** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the related report of ACABQ, drew attention to the Advisory Committee's conclusions, which were contained in paragraph 8 of its report. Noting the quality of the report introduced by

the United Nations Security Coordinator, he said that the Advisory Committee would follow closely the results of the new mechanism of accountability and responsibility established in the area of security.

84. **Ms. Attwooll** (United States of America) asked whether it would be possible to submit an annual report on accountability mechanisms. In particular, she wished to know whether incentives were being effectively implemented and what their results were.

85. **Mr. Myat** (United Nations Security Coordinator) replied that the Secretary-General's report gave a detailed description of the mechanisms established to ensure that the various individuals responsible for security discharged their responsibilities. Future reports would focus on the monitoring of those mechanisms.

86. **Mr. Mselle** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that, taking into account the streamlining of documentation, a separate report on accountability measures was not necessary; it would be sufficient for that aspect to be dealt with in the report to be submitted on the implementation of the new security mechanism and the cost-sharing arrangements approved by the General Assembly at its fifty-sixth session as recommended by ACABQ.

87. **The Chairman** suggested that the Secretariat should draw up a draft decision for consideration by the Fifth Committee in which the Committee would recommend to the General Assembly that it should take note of the report of the Secretary-General on inter-organizational security measures: framework for accountability for the United Nations field security management system (A/57/365) and endorse the recommendations made by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions in its report (A/57/7/Add.11).

88. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 147: Financing of the United Nations Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina (A/57/449 and A/57/486)

89. **Mr. Halbwachs** (Assistant Secretary-General for Programme Planning, Budget and Accounts, Controller), introducing the report of the Secretary-General on the proposed donation of assets from the United Nations Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina (UNMIBH) to the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina, pointed out that the mandate of the Mission would be completed on 31 December 2002. Consequently, in the context of the liquidation of the Mission's assets, it was proposed that assets with an inventory value of US$ 7.1 million should be donated to the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The General Assembly was invited to take action on that donation, in accordance with the provisions mentioned in paragraph 4 of the report.

90. **Mr. Mselle** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the related report of ACABQ, drew attention to the Advisory Committee's recommendation, which was contained in paragraph 5 of its report. It was understood that that recommendation was addressed to the General Assembly.

91. **Mr. Repasch** (United States of America) wished to know whether, in the context of that Mission, the United Nations had incurred any costs on account of the failure of the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina to respect the agreement on the status of peacekeeping forces.

92. **Mr. Halbwachs** (Assistant Secretary-General for Programme Planning, Budget and Accounts, Controller) replied that, to his knowledge, the United Nations had not incurred any costs of that kind during the Mission.

93. **The Chairman** suggested that the Secretariat should draw up a draft decision for consideration by the Fifth Committee in which it would recommend to the General Assembly that it should take note of the report of the Secretary-General on the proposed donation of assets to the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina and of the corresponding report of ACABQ and approve the donation of assets to the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

94. *It was so decided.*

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.